

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please insert Figure 1B with the following Replacement Sheet attached hereto.
No new matter is believed entered.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet for Figure 1B

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-12 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Figure 1B has been added, and the specification has been amended as noted to provide proper reference to Figure 1B. No new matter has been entered.

Claim 13 remains the same as previously presented in light of the Examiner's previous indication of allowability of original claim 9, if rewritten to overcome the noted objections under 35 USC 112 (see the Office action dated 03/09/2007). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 remains in condition for allowance.

Regarding item 4 of the Office action, the drawings were objected to for failure to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the cutting unit is not shown in a turned position. Accordingly, Figure 1B has been added to show the cutting unit at a turned position along the direction of arrow C. It is to be appreciated that Figure 1B illustrates only one example turned position, and that various other turned positions (e.g., other angles, etc.) are also contemplated. The specification has similarly been amended to provide proper reference to Figure 1B. No new matter has been entered. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Regarding item 5 of the Office action, the drawings were objected to for failure to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the gear transmission in combination with the brake pad must be shown. However, the objection is now moot because the "gear transmission" limitation has been removed from the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Regarding item 7a of the Office action, claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 112. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the specification did not describe operation of the turnable connection in relationship to the connection between the drive shaft and the tool head. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is in error. The noted operational connection is described on at least page 2, lines 12-15 and 17-20, wherein the specification states, respectively, "[t]he drive unit 11 can be of any type such as an internal combustion engine or an electric motor whose output shaft is connected to a drive shaft, not shown, that is placed within the shaft tube and that via a gear 14 is connected to the cutting unit," and "[t]he cutting unit 13 in a conventional manner is provided with stationary, comb shaped knife protectors co-operating with corresponding knives arranged to move forwards/backwards and being driven by the drive shaft via the gear 14." See also Figure 1. Thus, the specification clearly describes that drive power is provided by the drive unit (11) to the cutting unit (13) by the drive shaft and gear (14).

Additionally, per MPEP 2163.07(a), it is submitted that the specification provides an adequate written description to support all of the claims with respect to the noted gear (14). Specifically, the above-cited disclosure regarding the gear (14) provides sufficient description as to the function performed by the gears to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the invention. No further explicit description is required. Indeed, the Examiner has admitted that "it is well known in the art to utilize a set of derive gears as a connection mechanism between the tool head and shaft for imparting a driving motion from the power source to the tool head." See page 5, section 7a of the instant Office action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding item 7b of the Office action, claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 112. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the specification did not describe operation of the gear transmission with the control means (M) of Figure 5. However, the objection is now moot because the "gear transmission" limitation has been removed from the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited

Appl No. 10/534,779
Amendment Dated February 29, 2008
Reply to Office Action Date: November 29, 2007

to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. ABE1-38205.

Respectfully submitted,
Pearne & Gordon LLP

/Bryan M. Gallo/
Bryan M. Gallo, Reg. No. 59814

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
216-579-1700

February 29, 2008